



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the divorce court in 1886 threatened political life in England with a loss comparable with that sustained when Huskisson was killed at the opening of the Manchester and Liverpool Railway in 1830. But to the end of his life in 1910, as the Gwynn-Tuckwell biography recalls, Dilke acted in accordance with the plan he drew up for himself when he left Cambridge in 1866. "My aim in life", he then wrote, in an intimate letter to his brother, Ashton Dilke, "is to be of the greatest use I can to the world at large, not because that is my duty, but because that is the course which will make my life happiest." He did much useful work—much to help the coming time—in and out of Parliament in the years when there was no longer a place for him either on the Treasury bench or the front opposition bench in the House of Commons.

Dilke's interest in labor and industrial politics dated back to his first term in the House of Commons as member for Chelsea; and when he again became an unofficial member in 1892—this time as the representative of a mining constituency—it was no forced change for him to throw himself completely into industrial politics. More immediate and more obvious successes were his fortune in the industrial field than in the official work that occupied him from 1880 to 1885. If the Liberal party of the twenty years that preceded the war lost much by the tragedy of 1885-1886, the movement toward better industrial and social conditions gained enormously by Dilke's transference of his activities. He did much to forward the establishment of the old age pension system on a non-contributory basis. He achieved outstanding successes in drastic legislation for dealing with dangerous trades and sweated industries; and the Labor party of 1906-1914, in its legislative achievements, owed much to the continuous assistance it received from Dilke.

Dilke's was not a conventional political career. It was not possible for him after 1886 to continue along the conventional lines that he followed from 1880 to 1885. His career, none the less, was one of the most interesting of those of the men who came to the front in the reign of Queen Victoria; and his biographers are to be congratulated on their production of a book that has a value as abiding as that of almost any of the great political biographies of the period from the first Reform Act to the Great War.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Recollections. By JOHN, Viscount MORLEY, O.M. In two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. x, 388; vi, 382. \$7.50.)

THESE volumes are given to a world which is intensely preoccupied. We think much about the Junkers and not a little about the Bolsheviks, but the enlightened, high-minded Liberals of whom Lord Morley writes are consigned for the moment to a vague and shadowy background. Would that it were otherwise! But facts will not budge. Whoever

takes up a book nowadays either finds it filled with the War or at once proceeds to translate it into terms of the War—that is to say into his own terms of the War. Here, however, one is reminded of Matthew Arnold's lines on Wordsworth:

The cloud of mortal destiny,
Others may front it fearlessly—
But who, like him, will put it by?

So it is with Lord Morley and the War. He "puts it by"—at least in the sense of disregarding it. The era of which he writes may not have been the Golden Age as sung by Virgil at the close of the Second Georgic, but under the aspect which it wears in these pages the Victorian period was, relatively speaking, a time of philosophic calm—*necdum etiam audierant inflari classica*. Even the debates on Gladstonian Home Rule seem academic when compared with the Retreat from Mons and the defence of the Ypres Salient.

Some observations of this character are needed to emphasize the fact that Lord Morley in touching upon the high points of his long and exceptional career speaks to a world which is steeped to saturation in affairs of its own. Hence where many would have given full attention to this work five years ago, the number of its attentive readers today is likely to be much smaller than one could wish. Since to Lord Morley himself temperament and years have long since brought the philosophic mind, he will be the last to expect his reminiscences to hold the centre of the stage for a season as did his *Life of Gladstone*. At the same time it would be most unfortunate if war cares and interests were to crowd out such a record as this from the attention of those whose horizon is wider than the concerns of a single twelvemonth, lustrum, or decade.

It is a great thing to have been for a full generation the Aristides of English public life; and moreover in that time no one could have been found to vote for Lord Morley's ostracism on the ground that his robust honesty was too obtrusive. His phrase about Chamberlain's genius for friendship is at least equally apt in its application to himself. Those who know anything about his part in British politics are fully seized of the fact that he was never a cross-bench man. If at the moment when he entered the House of Commons some may have prophesied for him the futilities of a doctrinaire, his thirty years of active partizanship prove that he was willing to put his brains into joint stock with those of other people. But while he stuck to the organization and made clear-cut speeches on the West Meath Election he won to an uncommon degree the liking as well as the respect of all the public men whose friendship was worth having.

It is important to lay stress upon these two things: the intensity of Morley's interest in politics and the rare quality of his friendships. These are facts which stand out from his *Recollections* in the highest of high relief. Indeed the concluding words of his Introduction couple

these two motives in a manner which is strikingly characteristic. "Much of my ground obviously involves others; deeply should I regret if a single page were found unfair or likely to wound just sensibilities. More deeply still should I deplore, if a single page or phrase or passing mood of mine were either to dim the lamp of loyalty to Reason, or to dishearten earnest and persistent zeal for wise politics, in younger readers with their lives before them." This last is his selected epigraph and in his reference to the just sensibilities of others may be seen that considerateness which is so large and so essential an element in friendship. And then there is the "loyalty to Reason" which existed before he met Mill, which was stimulated by his contact with Mill, which shines out in his tractate on *Compromise* and was throughout his lode-star.

These, then, are the materials out of which Lord Morley's life has been compacted and which furnish the stuff for his *Recollections*: a willingness to advance in whatever direction was indicated by Reason; a burning interest in public affairs, to some extent as a game but essentially as representing the means by which the lives of millions might be enlarged through the introduction of liberal and humane measures; and that warmth of sympathy which invites, or rather which compels, friendship. Any autobiography which covers two volumes is to some extent a labyrinth, but with the clues just indicated the reader of Lord Morley's *Recollections* will find his way about quite easily.

Approached from another angle this work is a record of persistent, unflagging energy. At no stage has Lord Morley loitered. Whether as man of letters, parliamentarian, or executive, he has given himself without stint to the task at hand, cultivating his garden by the most intensive methods. Every advanced community can show among its intellectuals certain handsome and luxuriant foliage plants, and for such in reasonable quantities there is a due place. But the labors of Lord Morley have been essentially fruitful. It is meritorious to be learned, or to write well, or to speak well, or to be a useful administrator. The combination in one man of all these qualifications not only implies high natural faculty but rigorous discipline. Following Bacon's classic phrase a several and important training is to be gained through reading, writing, and conference. It has been the rare experience of Lord Morley to illustrate what can be done by those who know how to use in the forum the sources of strength which they derive from the closet.

In these volumes his record of youthful days is scant, embracing no more than a characterization of his father and brief sketches of the men he knew at Oxford—particularly Thomas Fowler, Overton, and Cotter Morison. On leaving Lincoln College at twenty-two he became a journalist in London. 1860 was a fine date at which to advance from the University to the larger school of the world, and one of the most striking chapters in the whole work—a chapter entitled the Spirit of the Time—is devoted to the intellectual forces then at work. Thrown into the thick of London Morley at once proved that he could hold his own

with the pen, and quickly established two of his most important friendships, those with George Meredith and John Stuart Mill. At the same time he was drawing intellectual and moral stimulus from the Continent—from Comte, Victor Hugo, Mazzini, and George Sand.

Equipped for the rôle by solid reading and first-hand thinking, Morley became a real leader of public opinion when he succeeded G. H. Lewes as editor of the *Fortnightly Review*. During the Seventies this periodical made itself felt very widely as an organ of humane and sympathetic rationalism. Lord Morley tells us that from Comte he learned "to do justice to truths presented and services rendered by men in various schools, with whom in important and even in vital respects I could not in the least bring myself to agree". This catholicity of spirit was reflected in the *Fortnightly*, for while its contributors could fight hard round the carroccio they were not on the whole very free from self-righteousness and intellectual vanity. During this same period Morley wrote his books on Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot, besides sounding the clarion note which runs through his "little volume" on *Compromise*. Of his friendships with other leading Liberals there is a graphic record in the full-length portraits which he gives of Herbert Spencer, Leslie Stephen, Henry Sidgwick, and Matthew Arnold.

The life of Cobden (1881), soon followed by the editorship of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, marks the transition by which Morley passed from letters to politics, but the real bridge between these distinct periods of his life is represented by the firm, enduring friendship which he formed with Joseph Chamberlain. This began in 1873, and as the bonds of intimacy strengthened Morley found himself impelled towards public life by the development of latent aptitudes and by a new sense of apostleship. To those who are familiar with his writings without knowing much about the details of his life, the depth of his fondness for Chamberlain may come with some surprise. In any case it seems unlikely that Chamberlain should ever be presented under a more attractive guise than that which he wears in these volumes.

Without going into such detail as is beyond the scope of the present notice, it would be impossible to comment at all properly upon the political labors of Lord Morley. Here the two landmarks are, of course, Ireland and India. But one who was for thirty years a leading figure in Parliament accumulates reminiscences which go far before the range of his own special activities. On the whole the political data which are furnished in these pages will be found to possess their chief value from the light which they cast on Morley's own mentality and aspirations. Dicey has said that aristocracy emphasizes the differences between men while democracy lays stress upon the resemblances. Morley, with no foolish prejudices against the well-born, has been a staunch democrat from the depth and fervor of his sympathy with the common lot. Alike as Chief Secretary for Ireland and at the India Office he showed the spirit of a constructive statesman who shaped his acts to accord with a disinterested and lofty standard.

To comment briefly upon a work so filled with suggestion, so crowded with notable figures, and so instinct with the author's personality is to accept a contradiction in terms, but at least a finger-post can be set up which will point towards a remarkable record. There are those whose historical interests centre in the emergence and development of ideas. A still larger number look upon history as past politics. But however historians may group themselves with respect to their dominant interests, no one can deny the high importance of Lord Morley's *Recollections* unless he deliberately excludes from his interests the life and thought of England during the past century.

Best of all there are here revealed the lineaments of a statesman who shared Turgot's sympathy for the common man, and who was willing to follow the argument wherever it might lead.

C. W. COLBY.

L'Empereur Frédéric III. (1831-1888). By HENRI WELSCHINGER, de l'Institut de France. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1917. Pp. xii, 335. 5 fr.)

M. HENRI WELSCHINGER, who has already published a biography of Bismarck, essays in this volume to show some of the effects of the chancellor's policy of blood and iron. This policy was, from the beginning, distasteful to the Crown Prince Frederick, who alone among the Hohenzollerns succumbed to the liberal tradition of England; Bismarck, hating this liberalism, systematically excluded him from any real share in the government of Prussia and Germany; in the short reign of ninety-nine days in 1888 the issue was fairly joined between Frederick and the "loyal servant of William I.", and the death of the former before he could inaugurate a less autocratic régime left the Bismarckian system triumphant, ready to the hand of William II. All this is well known, but there is a real interest in having it summarized, for "how much would the destinies of Europe probably have been changed if he who was called by his people 'Frederick the Noble' had been able to reign as long as William I., to show the full measure of his talents, and to give effect to his generous intentions" (p. ii).

In a volume of more than three hundred pages, only 123 are devoted to the life of Frederick III., of which four suffice to describe his activities from 1871 to 1878. In his account of the emperor's last illness, M. Welschinger follows entirely the narrative of Sir Morell Mackenzie and uses the counterblasts of the German physicians only to disclose their jealousy. The second part of the book contains the most important passages of the Crown Prince's *Diary* for 1870-1871, and this leads on to an illuminating narrative of Bismarck's judicial proceedings against Geffcken for publishing it in the *Deutsche Rundschau*. M. Welschinger thinks that the chancellor's failure to secure Geffcken's conviction had momentous consequences: William II. had accepted the Bismarckian